



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,832	04/02/2001	Bangalore S. Manjunath	Q59548	8468

7590 06/18/2003

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

HAMILTON, MONPLAISIR G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SL

SUPPLEMENTAL DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-37 are pending.

Interview

2. In a telephonic interview with Cameron Beddard (Reg. No. 46545), attorney for applicant, examiner was notified that the office action mailed on 3/11/2003 did not address Claim 27. This action corrects this deficiency.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statements filed 4/30/03 and 5/01/03 fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(c) because it lacks a statement as specified in 37 CFR 1.97(e). They have been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

The information disclosure statements filed 4/30/03 and 5/01/03 fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(c) because it lacks the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p). They have been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Election/Restrictions

4. Claims 38-51 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 8.

Priority

5. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-26 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6430553 issued to Ferret herein referred to as Ferret.

Referring to Claim 1, 15 and 26:

Ferret discloses a database building method for multimedia contents, the method comprising the steps of: accessing an arbitrary site providing multimedia contents through a telecommunication network (col 1, lines 45-60); calling multimedia contents in by spidering (col 1, lines 58-61); and classifying the multimedia contents data according to stored addresses and storing the multimedia contents data in a predetermined database (col 1, lines 65 – col 2, line 5).

Referring to Claim 2 and 16:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 and 15 above. Ferret further discloses the multimedia contents data is image data (col 6, lines 25-35; col 8, lines 25-30).

Referring to Claim 3:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. Ferret further discloses the stored addresses are universal resource locators (URLS) (col 6, lines 25-35; col 8, lines 20-25).

Referring to Claim 4:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. Ferret further discloses the arbitrary site is selected between a retrieval site or a portal site (col 6, lines 53-56).

Referring to Claim 5 and 17:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 4 and 15 above. Ferret further discloses step (b) further comprises the sub-steps of: (b-1) inputting a search word (col 6, lines 53-56); (b-2) parsing texts corresponding to file names of multimedia contents or texts corresponding to sub-categories in hyper text markup language (HTML) web page data having retrieved results from the input search word (col 8, lines 20-35); and (b-3) calling multimedia contents data having addresses corresponding to the parsed texts (col 8, lines 10-55).

Referring to Claim 6 and 18:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 5 and 17 above. Ferret further discloses (p-b-3-1) visiting a corresponding category when the texts corresponding to the sub-category are parsed in a loaded HTML web page data (col 5, line 65- col 6, line 30).

Referring to Claim 7, 19 and 31:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 5, 17 and 28. Ferret further discloses keywords representing characteristics of the texts corresponding to the sub-categories together with the texts corresponding to the file names of the multimedia contents are parsed in loaded HTML web page data (col 7, line 50- col 8, line 40).

Referring to Claim 8 and 28:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 5 and 26 above. Ferret further discloses the called multimedia contents data is called image data (col 8, lines 25-30).

Referring to Claim 9, 20 and 29:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 8, 16 and 26 above. Ferret further discloses filtering noise images out of the called image data to get a filtered image (col 8, lines 35-40).

Referring to Claim 10, 21 and 30:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 9, 20 and 29 above. Ferret further discloses determining whether or not a pixel number of the filtered image is equal to or greater than a predetermined threshold value; and indexing the corresponding image when the pixel number of the filtered image is equal or greater than the predetermined threshold value (col 8, lines 35-40).

Referring to Claim 11 and 22:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 10 and 21 above. Ferret further discloses the predetermined threshold value is 128 (col 8, lines 35-40).

Referring to Claim 12, 23 and 32:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 4, 16 and 30 above. Ferret further discloses decreasing the resolution of the called multimedia contents if the multimedia content is an image and storing the image of which resolution was decreased in the predetermined database according to a categorized structure (col 6, lines 25-30).

Referring to Claim 13 and 24:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 3 and 15 above. Ferret further discloses the URL of a web page storing the called multimedia contents is stored in the predetermined database using the URL information (col 8, lines 25-30).

Referring to Claim 14 and 25:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 7 and 15 above. Ferret further discloses at least one of URL information or keyword information together with information on respective images is stored in respective predetermined databases so that keywords can be linked to individual images (col 6, lines 25-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 33-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6430553 issued to Ferret herein referred to as Ferret in view of US 6463430 issued to Brady et al, herein referred to as Brady.

Referring to Claim 33:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 26 above.

Ferret does not explicitly disclose "a control unit for outputting a control signal, wherein it is determined whether or not a number of indexed multimedia contents is equal to or greater than a predetermined number, and when the number of indexed multimedia contents is equal to or greater than the predetermined number, the control signal has a first predetermined logic level

Art Unit: 2172

and when the indexed multimedia contents is less than the predetermined number, the control signal has a second predetermined logic level.”

Brady discloses a control unit for outputting a control signal, wherein it is determined whether or not a number of indexed multimedia contents is equal to or greater than a predetermined number, and when the number of indexed multimedia contents is equal to or greater than the predetermined number, the control signal has a first predetermined logic level and when the indexed multimedia contents is less than the predetermined number, the control signal has a second predetermined logic level (col 3, lines 5-10).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Ferret such that a logic signal about the number of indexed materials can be used to make a decision. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow the indexing method to stop (col 3, lines 5-10).

Referring to Claim 34:

Ferret in view of Brady discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 33 above. Brady further discloses responding to the control signal having the first predetermined logic level, a parser finishes parsing, and responding to the control signal having the second predetermined logic level, the parser parses text corresponding to the addresses of other web pages or sites linked to HTML web page data (col 3, 5-10).

8. Claims 27 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6430553 issued to Ferret herein referred to as Ferret in view of US 5903892 issued to Hoffert et al, herein referred to as Hoffert.

Referring to Claim 27:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 26 above.

Ferret does not explicitly disclose a web visitor selects and visits an arbitrary retrieval site; loads root HTML web page data from the arbitrary retrieval site; visits a corresponding sub-category after texts corresponding to the sub-category are parsed in the loaded HTML web page data; and hierarchically visits other web pages or sited linked to the loaded HTML web page and having addresses corresponding to the parsed texts corresponding to the sub-category.

Hoffert discloses a web visitor selects and visits an arbitrary retrieval site (col 3, line 34-36; col 4, lines 49-53); loads root HTML web page data from the arbitrary retrieval site (col 3, 35-45); visits a corresponding sub-category after texts corresponding to the sub-category are parsed in the loaded HTML web page data (col 3, lines 40-45); and hierarchically visits other web pages or sited linked to the loaded HTML web page and having addresses corresponding to the parsed texts corresponding to the sub-category (col 3, lines 30-col 4, line 30).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Ferret to spider a website by visiting the links associated with a root or parent site. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow the crawler to be constrained to operate within a completely single parent URL (col 4, lines 14-17).

Referring to Claim 35:

Ferret discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 26 above.

Ferret does not explicitly disclose “a first database for storing category information; a second database for storing URL information; a third database for storing lists of keywords; and a fourth database for storing multimedia contents indexed by information stored in the first database, second database, and third database.”

Hoffert a first database for storing category information; a second database for storing URL information; a third database for storing lists of keywords; and a fourth database for storing multimedia contents indexed by information stored in the first database, second database, and third database (col 6, lines 20-40).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Ferret such that information is stored in multiple databases. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow quick and efficient access to the data.

Referring to Claim 36:

Ferret in view of Hoffert discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 35 above.

Hoffert further discloses the fourth database stores information on URLs storing indexed multimedia contents using information stored in the first database second database and third database (col 7, lines 50-65; col 8, lines 15-25).

Art Unit: 2172

Referring to Claim 37:

Ferret in view of Hoffert discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 35 above.

Hoffert further discloses the multimedia contents stored in the fourth database are thumbnails of original images, which are generated by decreasing resolution of the original image (col 7, lines 60-65; col 20, lines 1-40).


Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monplaisir G Hamilton whose telephone number is 1703-305-5116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on 1703-305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 1703-746-7239 for regular communications and 1703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 1703-305-3900.

Monplaisir Hamilton
June 3, 2003


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100